

Atty Dkt. No.: 10010724-2
USSN: 10/033,823

REMARKS

Certain independent claims have been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 4, which claim is indicated as allowable. Specifically, Claims 1, 31, 33 and 47 have been amended to include subject matter analogous to that of Claim 4.

Claim 4 is cancelled, Claim 5 is amended to now depend from Claim 1 and Claim 48 has been amended to remove reference to means for assembling the received documents from the plurality of sites into a single list, as such subject matter has been included in Claim 47 as noted above.

Claim 50 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 53, which claim is indicated as allowable, and Claim 53 is cancelled.

Claim 30 is amended to specify that the method is a method of performing a life-science-specific domain specific metasearch and is also amended to specify that the data mining module is optimized specifically for the life sciences. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification, e.g., at paragraphs 0045-0047, 0055-0056 and 0062-0063.

Claims 3-17, 35, 37, 52 and 53 are indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants thank the examiner for the indication of allowability.

As no new matter has been added by the above amendments, the Applicants respectfully request the entry thereof.

Atty Dkt. No.: 10010724-2
USSN: 10/033,823

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 18, 19, 22, 34, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by applicant's admitted prior art at paragraphs 0008-0010.

Independent Claim 1, from which Claims 18, 19, and 22 depend, has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 4, which claim has been found allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants believe these claims to be in order for allowance. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 34 depends from Claim 30 which has been amended to specify that the method is a method of performing a life-science-specific domain specific metasearch and is also amended to specify supplying the raw data search results in the form of text documents from each member of the selected set of the generic, web-based search engines, publications sites, sequences sites, protein structure databases and pathway information databases which are relevant to the query to a data mining module that is optimized specifically for the life sciences.

In making this rejection, the Examiner indicates that "Applicant seems to emphasize in the background...that although existing metasearch engines employ some type of unsupervised clustering...none of them have data mining algorithms tuned specifically to the sciences or more particularly to the life sciences." The Examiner remarks that this limitation [data mining algorithms tuned specifically to the sciences or more particularly to the life sciences] is not reflected in the claim language. Accordingly, Claim 30 now specifies a life science-specific domain specific metasearch. Furthermore, Claim 30 now specifies that the raw data is supplied to a data mining module that is optimized specifically for the life sciences. Since the prior art does not teach a method of performing a life science-specific domain specific metasearch that includes supplying raw data search results in the form of text documents from each member of the selected set of the generic, web-based search engines, publications sites, sequences sites, protein structure databases and pathway information databases which are relevant to the query, to a data mining module that is optimized specifically for the life sciences, Claim 34, which depends from Claim 30, is not anticipated by paragraphs 008-0010 of the instant application, especially since it is acknowledged that the background section of the instant application emphasizes that none of the existing metasearch engines have data mining algorithms tuned specifically to the life sciences. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 50 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 53, which claim is indicated as allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants believe Claim 50 to be in order for allowance.

Atty Dkt. No.: 10010724-2
USSN: 10/033,823

As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 20, 21, 30, 31, 33, 47, 48, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over the Applicant's admitted prior art at paragraphs 0008-0012.

Claims 20 and 21 depend from Claim 1. As described above, Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 4 which is indicated as allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants believe these claims to be in order for allowance. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 30, for reasons analogous to those describe above, i.e., the Applicants have not admitted to, nor is there any art of record, that teaches or suggests a method of performing a life science-specific domain specific metasearch that includes supplying raw data search results in the form of text documents from each member of the selected set of the generic, web-based search engines, publications sites, sequences sites, protein structure databases and pathway information databases which are relevant to the query, to a data mining module that is optimized specifically for the life sciences, Claim 30 is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 of the instant application for at least this reason. In fact, the background section of the instant application specifically notes that the metasearch engines available as of the filing date of the instant application lack all of the features claimed in Claims 30. Accordingly, for at least this reason Claim 30 is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 of the instant application. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 31 has been amended to include subject matter analogous to that of Claim 4 which is indicated as allowable subject matter. Specifically, Claim 31 now specifies that the data mining module, upon receiving the raw data, processes the raw data independently of the unsupervised clustering procedure and prepares a single list of all of the documents, after eliminating documents not reachable via the web. Paragraphs 0008-0012 of the instant application do not teach or suggest a method of performing a domain specific metasearch that includes all of the elements of the claim including a step of supplying the raw data to a data mining module as now specified in Claim 31.

Accordingly, for at least this reason Claim 31 is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 of the instant application. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 33 has been amended to specify a computer system having means for assembling the received documents from the plurality of sites searched by the selected particular search engines into a single list after eliminating documents not reachable via the web. This subject matter is analogous

Atty Dkt. No.: 10010724-2
USSN: 10/033,823

to the subject matter of allowed claim 4. Paragraphs 0008-0012 of the instant application do not teach or suggest a computer system that includes all of the elements claimed in Claim 33.

Accordingly, for at least this reason Claim 33 is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 of the instant application. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

With regards to Claims 47 and 48, Claim 47 has been amended to specify a computer system having means for preparing a single list of all the documents independently of forming clusters, after eliminating documents not reachable via the web. This subject matter is analogous to the subject matter of allowed claim 4. Paragraphs 0008-0012 of the instant application do not teach or suggest a computer system that includes all of the elements claimed in Claim 47. Accordingly, for at least this reason Claims 47 and 48 are patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 of the instant application. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 51 depends from Claim 50. As described above, Claim 50 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 53 which is indicated as allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants believe Claim 51 to be in order for allowance. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over the Applicant's admitted prior art at paragraphs 0008-0012 and in further view of Cutting et al "Scatter/Gather: a cluster-based approach to browsing large document collections". ACM 1992, pages 318-329.

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1. As described above, Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 4 which is indicated as allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants believe Claim 2 to be in order for allowance. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 36 depends from Claim 33 which has been amended to specify a computer system having means for assembling the received documents from the plurality of sites searched by the selected particular search engines into a single list after eliminating documents not reachable via the web. This subject matter is analogous to the subject matter of allowed claim 4. Neither paragraphs 0008-0012, nor Cutting et al, teach or suggest a computer system as claimed in Claim 33 that includes means for assembling the received documents from the plurality of sites searched by the selected particular search engines into a single list after eliminating documents not reachable via the web and as such is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 in view of Cutting et al. Since Claim 36 depends from Claim 33, Claim 36 is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 in view of Cutting et al. for at least this reason. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be

Atty Dkt. No.: 10010724-2
USSN: 10/033,823

withdrawn.

Claims 23-29, 32, 38-46, 49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over the Applicant's admitted prior art at paragraphs 0008-0012 and in further view of Anwar (US 2001/0047355).

Claims 23-29 depend from Claim 1. As described above, Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 4 which is indicated as allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants believe Claims 23-29 to be in order for allowance. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 32 depends from Claim 31. As described above, Claim 31 has been amended to include subject matter analogous to that of Claim 4 which is indicated as allowable. Specifically, Claim 31 now specifies that the data mining module, upon receiving the raw data, processes the raw data independently of the unsupervised clustering procedure and prepares a single list of all of the documents, after eliminating documents not reachable via the web. Neither paragraphs 0008-0012, nor Anwar teach or suggest a computer system as claimed in Claim 31 that includes a data mining module, upon receiving the raw data, processes the raw data independently of the unsupervised clustering procedure and prepares a single list of all of the documents, after eliminating documents not reachable via the web and as such is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 in view of Anwar. Since Claim 32 depends from Claim 31, Claim 32 is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 in view of Anwar for at least this reason. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 38-46 depend from Claim 33. As describe above, Claim 33 has been amended to specify a computer system having means for assembling the received documents from the plurality of sites searched by the selected particular search engines into a single list after eliminating documents not reachable via the web. This subject matter is analogous to the subject matter of claim 4 which is indicated as allowable. Neither paragraphs 0008-0012, nor Anwar teach or suggest a computer system as claimed in Claim 33 that includes means for assembling the received documents ~~from the plurality of sites searched by the selected particular search engines into a single list after~~ eliminating documents not reachable via the web and as such is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 in view of Anwar. Since Claims 38-46 depend from Claim 33, Claims 38-46 are patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 in view of Anwar for at least this reason. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Atty Dkt. No.: 10010724-2
USSN: 10/033,823

Claim 49 depends from Claims 47. Claim 47 has been amended to specify a computer system having means for preparing a single list of all the documents independently of forming clusters, after eliminating documents not reachable via the web. Accordingly, Claim 47, and Claim 49 by virtue of its dependency from Claim 47, has been amended to include subject matter that is analogous to the subject matter of allowed claim 4. Neither paragraphs 0008-0012, nor Anwar teach or suggest a computer system as claimed in Claim 47 that includes means for preparing a single list of all the documents independently of forming clusters, after eliminating documents not reachable via the web. and as such is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 in view of Anwar. Since Claim 49 depends from Claim 47, Claim 49 is patentable over paragraphs 0008-0012 in view of Anwar for at least this reason. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 54 depends from Claim 50. As described above, Claim 50 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 53 which is indicated as allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants believe Claim 54 to be in order for allowance. As such, the Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Atty Dkt. No.: 10010724-2
USSN: 10/033,823

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks, this application is considered to be in good and proper form for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 and 1.17 which may be required by this paper, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1078, reference no. 10010724-1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/8/04

By: [Signature]
Susan Tall
Registration No. 52,272

Date: 9.8.04

By: [Signature]
Bret Field
Registration No. 37,620

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DI.429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, Colorado 80537-0599

F:\DOCUMENT\AGIL\029\response to oa dated 06-08-04.doc